arXiv:1601.07659v1 [math.DG] 28 Jan 2016

K-SEMISTABILITY OF CSCK MANIFOLDS WITH TRANSCENDENTAL COHOMOLOGY CLASS

ZAKARIAS SJÖSTRÖM DYREFELT

ABSTRACT. We prove that constant scalar curvature Kähler (cscK) manifolds with transcendental cohomology class are K-semistable, naturally generalising the case of polarised manifolds. As a main step of the proof we establish, in the general Kähler setting, a formula relating the (generalised) Donaldson-Futaki invariant to the asymptotic slope of the K-energy along weak geodesic rays. The results are obtained via a potential-theoretic approach that circumvents the use of Deligne pairings, which is a key tool in the polarised case, but no longer available in our setting.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries 5
3. Cohomological test configurations and K-semistability 9
4. Transcendental Kempf-Ness type formulas 15
5. Asymptotics for the K-energy 20
References 25

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we are interested in questions of stability for constant scalar curvature Kähler (cscK) manifolds with *transcendental*[1] cohomology class. To this end, let (X, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold. Consider $\alpha := [\omega] \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$. When α is the first Chern class $c_1(L)$ of some ample line bundle L over X, such questions are closely related to the Yau-Tian-Donaldson (YTD) conjecture [Don02, Tia97, Yau06]: A polarised algebraic manifold (X, L) is K-polystable if and only if the polarisation class $c_1(L)$ admits a Kähler metric of constant scalar curvature. This conjecture was recently confirmed in the *Fano case*, i.e. when $L = -K_X$, cf. [CDS15a, CDS15b, CDS15c, Tia15]. In this important special case, a cscK metric is nothing but a Kähler-Einstein metric. For general polarised cscK manifolds, the "if" direction of the YTD conjecture was initially proven by Mabuchi in [Mab08]. Prior to that, several partial results had been obtained by Donaldson [Don05a] and Stoppa [Sto09a], both assuming that $c_1(L)$ contains a cscK metric.

For transcendental classes very little is currently known about the validity of a correspondence between *existence of cscK metrics* and *stability* in the spirit of the YTD conjecture. Moreover, from a differential geometric point of view, there is no

[1]We use the word 'transcendental' to emphasise that the Kähler class in question is not necessarily of the form $c_1(L)$ for some ample line bundle L over X.

special reason to restrict attention to Kähler manifolds with associated integral (or rational) cohomology classes, which are then automatically of the form $\alpha = c_1(L)$ for some ample ($\mathbb{Q}$)-line bundle L over X. In order to extend the study of stability questions to a transcendental setting, recall that there is an intersection theoretic description of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant, cf. [Wan12] and [Oda13]. As first pointed out by Berman [Ber13], this leads to a straightforward generalised notion of K-stability in terms of cohomology. The setup is explained in detail in Section 3. Our main goal is to establish the following result.

Theorem A. *If the Mabuchi* (K-energy) *functional is bounded from below in the Kähler class $\alpha \in H^{1,1}(X,\mathbb{R})$, then (X,α) is* K-semistable (in the generalised sense of Definition 3.6).

As a consequence, *(X,α) is K-semistable if the Kähler class $\alpha \in H^{1,1}(X,\mathbb{R})$ admits a cscK representative*, cf. [BB15].

The corresponding statement in the case of a polarised manifold was first obtained by Donaldson in [Don05a], as an immediate consequence of the lower bound for the Calabi functional. See also [Sto09b] and [RT06] for related work on *slope semistability*. The approach taken in this paper should be compared to e.g. [PRS08] and [Ber13, Ber15, BHJ15, BHJ16], where K-semistability can be derived using Kempf-Ness type formulas. By analogy to the above papers, our proof relies on establishing Kempf-Ness type formulas valid also for transcendental classes (see Theorems B and C below) relating the asymptotic slope of the K-energy along weak geodesic rays to a natural generalisation of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant.

An underlying theme of the paper is the comparison to the extensively studied case of a polarised manifold, which becomes a "special case" in our setting. Notably, it is then known (see e.g. [Ber13, Ber15, BHJ15, BHJ16]) how to establish the sought Kempf-Ness type formulas using *Deligne pairings*; a method pioneered by Phong-Ross-Sturm in [PRS08] (for further background on the Deligne pairing construction, cf. [Elk90]). Unfortunately, such an approach breaks down in the case of a general Kähler class. In this paper, we circumvent this problem by a pluripotential approach, making use of a certain multivariate variant $\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\dots\theta_n)}(\varphi_0,\dots,\varphi_n)$ of the Monge-Ampère energy functional, which turns out to play a role analogous to that of the Deligne pairing in arguments of the type [PRS08].

1.1. **Generalised K-semistability.** We briefly explain the framework we have in mind. As a starting point, there are natural generalisations of certain key concepts to the transcendental setting, a central notion being that of *test configurations*. First recall that a test configuration for a polarised manifold (X,L), in the sense of Donaldson, cf. [Don02], is given in terms of a $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant degeneration $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L})$ of (X,L). It can be seen as an algebro-geometric way of compactifying the product $X \times \mathbb{C}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$. As remarked in [Ber13], a straightforward generalisation to the transcendental setting can be given by replacing the line bundles with $(1,1)-$cohomology classes. In the polarised setting we would thus consider $(\mathcal{X}, c_1(\mathcal{L}))$ as a "test configuration" for $(X, c_1(L))$, by simply replacing $\mathcal{L}$ and L with their respective first Chern classes. The *details* of how to formulate a good definition of such a generalised test configuration have, however, not yet been completely clarified. The definition given in this paper is motivated by a careful comparison to the usual polarised case, where we ensure that a number of basic but convenient tools still hold, cf. Section 3. In particular, our notion of K-semistability

coincides precisely with the usual one whenever we restrict to the case of an integral class, cf. Proposition 3.12. We will refer to such generalised test configurations as *cohomological*.

Definition 1.1. (Cohomological test configuration) *A cohomological test configuration for (X,α) is a pair $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ where $\mathcal{X}$ is a test configuration for X* (see Definition 3.1) *and $\mathcal{A}\in H^{1,1}_{\mathrm{BC}}(\mathcal{X},\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{C}^*}$ is a $\mathbb{C}^*$-invariant $(1,1)-$Bott-Chern cohomology class whose image under the canonical $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{X}\setminus\mathcal{X}_0\simeq X\times(\mathbb{P}^1\setminus\{0\})$$

is $p_1^*\alpha$, see (6). *Here $p_1: X\times\mathbb{P}^1\to X$ denotes the first projection.*

Remark 1.2. Note that the definition is given directly over $\mathbb{P}^1$ so that we consider the Bott-Chern cohomology on a compact Kähler normal complex space. In the polarised case, defining a test configuration over $\mathbb{C}$ or over $\mathbb{P}^1$ is indeed equivalent, due to the existence of a natural $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant compactification over $\mathbb{P}^1$.

In practice, it will be enough to consider the situation when the total space $\mathcal{X}$ is smooth and dominates $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$, with $\mu:\mathcal{X}\to X\times\mathbb{P}^1$ the corresponding canonical $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant bimeromorphic morphism. Moreover, if $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ is a cohomological test configuration for (X,α) with $\mathcal{X}$ as above, then $\mathcal{A}$ is always of the form $\mathcal{A}=\mu^*p_1^*\alpha+[D]$, for a unique $\mathbb{R}$-divisor D supported on the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$, cf. Proposition 3.8. A cohomological test configuration can thus be characterised by an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor, clarifying the relationship between the point of view of $\mathbb{R}$-divisors and our cohomological approach to "transcendental K-semistability".

A straightforward generalisation of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant can be defined based on the intersection theoretic characterisation of [Wan12] and [Oda13]. Indeed, we define the *Donaldson-Futaki invariant* associated to a cohomological test configuration $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ for (X,α) as the following intersection number

$$\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A}):=\frac{\bar{S}}{n+1}V^{-1}(\mathcal{A}^{n+1})_{\mathcal{X}}+V^{-1}(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}\cdot\mathcal{A}^n)_{\mathcal{X}},\tag{1}$$

computed on the (compact) total space $\mathcal{X}$. Here V and $\bar{S}$ are cohomological constants denoting the Kähler volume and mean scalar curvature of (X,α) respectively.

Finally, we say that (X,α) is *K-semistable* if $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})\geq 0$ for all cohomological test configurations $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ for (X,α) where the class $\mathcal{A}$ is *relatively Kähler*, i.e. there is a Kähler form β on $\mathbb{P}^1$ such that $\mathcal{A}+\pi^*\beta$ is Kähler on $\mathcal{X}$.

1.2. **Transcendental Kempf-Ness type formulas.** As previously stated, a central part of this paper consists in establishing a Kempf-Ness type formula connecting the *Donaldson-Futaki invariant* (in the sense of (1) above) with the *asymptotic slope of the K-energy* along certain weak geodesic rays. In fact, we first prove the following result, which is concerned with asymptotics of a certain multivariate analogue of the Monge-Ampère energy, cf. Section 2.1 for its definition. It turns out to be very useful for establishing a similar formula for the K-energy (cf. Remark 1.3), but may also be of independent interest.

In what follows, we will work on the level of potentials and refer the reader to Section 4 for precise definitions.

Theorem B. *Let X be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension n and let θ_i, $0\leq i\leq n$, be closed $(1,1)$-forms on X. Set $\alpha_i:=[\theta_i]\in H^{1,1}(X,\mathbb{R})$. Consider*

smooth cohomological test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{A}_i)$ *for* (X, α_i) *dominating* $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. *For each collection of smooth rays* $(\varphi_i^t)_{t\geq 0}$, $\mathcal{C}^\infty$*-compatible with* $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{A}_i)$ *respectively, the asymptotic slope of the multivariate energy functional* $\mathrm{E} := \mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}$ *is well-defined and satisfies*

$$\frac{\mathrm{E}(\varphi_0^t, \dots, \varphi_n^t)}{t} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{A}_0 \cdot \dots \cdot \mathcal{A}_n) \tag{2}$$

as $t \to +\infty$. *See* (7) *for the definition of the above intersection number.*

Remark 1.3. In the setting of Hermitian line bundles, the above multivariate energy functional naturally appears as the difference (or quotient) of metrics on Deligne pairings. Moreover, note that the above theorem applies to e.g. the Monge-Ampère energy functional E and its 'twisted' version $\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{Ric}(\omega)}$ but *not* to the K-energy M. Indeed, the expression for $\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t)$ on the form $\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}(\varphi_0^t, \dots, \varphi_n^t)$ involves the metric $\log(\omega + dd^c\varphi_t)$ on the relative canonical bundle $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}$, which blows up close to $\mathcal{X}_0$, cf. Section 5. As observed in [BHJ16], it is however possible to find functionals of the above form that 'approximate' M in the sense that their asymptotic slopes coincide, up to an explicit correction term that vanishes precisely when the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$ is reduced. This is a key observation.

We further remark that such a formula (2) cannot be expected to hold unless the test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{A}_i)$ and the rays (φ_i^t) are compatible in a certain sense. This is the role of the notion of $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatibility (as well as the $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatibility used in Theorem C below). These notions may seem technical, but in fact mimic the case of a polarised manifolds, where the situation is well understood in terms of extension of metrics on line bundles, cf. Section 4.1.

As an important consequence of the above Theorem B we deduce that if $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ is a smooth, relatively Kähler cohomological test configuration for (X, α) dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, then for each subgeodesic ray $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$, $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$, we have the inequality

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t)}{t} \leq \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}). \tag{3}$$

This is the content of Theorem 5.1, and should be compared to the discussion in the introduction of [PRS08]. As an important special case, this inequality can be seen to hold in the case of a weak geodesic ray associated to the given test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$, cf. Section 4.1 for its construction. The inequality (3) is moreover enough to conclude the proof of Theorem A, as explained in Section 5.2.

Using ideas from [BHJ16] adapted to the present setting, we may further improve on formula (3) and compute the precise asymptotic slope of the K-energy. In this context, it is natural to consider the *non-Archimedean Mabuchi functional*

$$\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) := \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) + V^{-1}((\mathcal{X}_{0,\mathrm{red}} - \mathcal{X}_0) \cdot \mathcal{A}^n)_{\mathcal{X}},$$

cf. [BHJ15] and [BHJ16] for an explanation of the terminology. It is a modification of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant which is *homogeneous under finite base change*, satisfying $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) \leq \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ with equality precisely when the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$ is reduced. We have the following result, special cases of which have been obtained by previous authors in various different situations and generality;

Theorem C. *Let* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ *be a smooth, relatively Kähler cohomological test configuration for* (X, α) *that dominates* $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. *For each subgeodesic ray* $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$,

$\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$*-compatible with* $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$*, we then have*

$$\frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t)}{t} \longrightarrow \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$$

as $t \to +\infty$.

In particular, this result holds when (φ_t) is the weak geodesic ray associated to $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$, constructed in Section 4.1.

For polarised manifolds (X,L) and *smooth* subgeodesic rays $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ this precise formula was proven in [BHJ16] using Deligne pairings, as pioneered by Phong-Ross-Sturm in [PRS08] (cf. also Paul-Tian [PT06] [PT09]). A formula in the same spirit has also been obtained for the so called *Ding functional* when X is a Fano variety, see [Ber15]. However, it appears as though no version of this result is currently known in the case of non-polarised manifolds.

Remark 1.4. (K-stability) We have been informed by R. Dervan and J. Ross that they very recently, and independently, established Theorem A (to appear in a coming preprint). They are further able to establish K-stability of (X,ω) whenever the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(X,\omega)$ is discrete.

1.3. **Structure of the paper.** In Section 2 we fix our notation for energy functionals and subgeodesic rays. In particular, we define the multivariate energy functional $\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\ldots,\theta_n)}$ of Theorem B, which plays a central role in this paper.

In Section 3 we introduce our generalised notion of *cohomological test configurations* and K-semistability. In the case of a polarised manifold (X,L), we compare this notion to the usual algebraic one. We discuss classes of cohomological test configurations for which it suffices to test K-semistability, and establish a number of basic properties.

In Section 4 we discuss transcendental Kempf-Ness type formulas and prove Theorem B. This involves introducing natural *compatibility conditions* between a ray (φ_t) and a cohomological test configuration $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ for (X,α). As a useful special case, we discuss the weak geodesic ray associated to $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$.

In Section 5 we finally apply Theorem B to yield a weak version of Theorem C, from which we in turn deduce Theorem A. By an immediate adaptation of techniques from [BHJ16] we then compute the precise asymptotic slope of the Mabuchi functional, thus establishing the full Theorem C.

1.4. **Acknowledgements.** It is a pleasure to thank my supervisors Sébastien Boucksom and Vincent Guedj, as well as Robert Berman and Ahmed Zeriahi for helpful discussions and suggestions.

2. Preliminaries

Let X be a compact complex manifold of $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} X = n$ equipped with a given Kähler form ω, i.e. a smooth real closed positive $(1,1)$-form on X. Denote the Kähler class $[\omega] \in H^{1,1}(X,\mathbb{R})$ by α.

In order to fix notation, let $\mathrm{Ric}(\omega) = -dd^c \log \omega^n$ be the Ricci curvature form, where $dd^c := \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi}\partial\bar{\partial}$ is normalised so that it represents the first Chern class $c_1(X)$. Its trace

$$\mathcal{S}(\omega) := n\frac{\mathrm{Ric}(\omega)\wedge\omega^{n-1}}{\omega^n}$$

denotes the scalar curvature of ω. The mean scalar curvature is the cohomological constant given by

$$\bar{\mathcal{S}} := V^{-1}\int_X \mathcal{S}(\omega)\,\omega^n = n\frac{\int_X c_1(X)\cdot\alpha^{n-1}}{\int_X \alpha^n} := n\frac{(c_1(X)\cdot\alpha^{n-1})_X}{(\alpha^n)_X}, \tag{4}$$

where $V := \int_X \omega^n := (\alpha^n)_X$ is the Kähler volume. We say that ω is a constant scalar curvature Kähler (cscK) metric[2] if $S(\omega)$ is constant (equal to $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$) on X.

Throughout the paper we work on the level of potentials, using the notation of quasi-plurisubharmonic (quasi-psh) functions. To this end, we let θ be a closed $(1,1)$-form on X and denote, as usual, by $\mathrm{PSH}(X,\theta)$ the space of θ-psh functions φ on X, i.e. the set of functions that can be locally written as the sum of a smooth and a plurisubharmonic function, and such that

$$\theta_\varphi := \theta + dd^c\varphi \geq 0$$

in the weak sense of currents. In particular, if ω is our fixed Kähler form on X, then we write

$$\mathcal{H} := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X) : \omega_\varphi := \omega + dd^c\varphi > 0\} \subset \mathrm{PSH}(X,\omega)$$

for the space of Kähler potentials on X. As a subset of $\mathcal{C}^\infty(X)$ it is convex and consists of strictly ω-psh functions. It has been extensively studied (for background we refer the reader to e.g. [Bou12] and references therein).

Recall that a θ-psh function is always upper semi-continuous (usc) on X, thus bounded from above by compactness. Moreover, if $\varphi_i \in \mathrm{PSH}(X,\theta)\cap L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}$, $1\leq i\leq p\leq n$, it follows from the work of Bedford-Taylor [BT76] that we can give meaning to the product $\bigwedge_{i=1}^p(\theta+dd^c\varphi_i)$, which then defines a closed positive (p,p)-current on X. As usual, we then define the *Monge-Ampère measure* as the following probability measure, given by the top wedge product

$$\mathrm{MA}(\varphi) := V^{-1}(\omega+dd^c\varphi)^n.$$

2.1. **Energy functionals.** We now introduce the notation for energy functionals that we will use. Let $\varphi_i \in \mathrm{PSH}(X,\omega)\cap L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}$. The *Monge-Ampère energy functional* (or *Aubin-Mabuchi functional*) $\mathrm{E} := \mathrm{E}_\omega$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{E}(\varphi) := \frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{j=0}^n V^{-1}\int_X \varphi(\omega+dd^c\varphi)^{n-j}\wedge\omega^j$$

(such that $\mathrm{E}' = \mathrm{MA}$ and $\mathrm{E}(0)=0$). Similarily, if θ is any closed $(1,1)$-form, we define a functional $\mathrm{E}^\theta := \mathrm{E}^\theta_\omega$ by

$$\mathrm{E}^\theta(\varphi) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} V^{-1}\int_X \varphi(\omega+dd^c\varphi)^{n-j-1}\wedge\omega^j\wedge\theta.$$

More generally, it is possible to define a natural *multivariate* version of the Monge-Ampère energy, which will prove useful in the sequel. To this end, let $\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n$ be closed $(1,1)$-forms on X. Motivated by corresponding properties for the *Deligne pairing* (cf. e.g. [Ber15], [Elk90] for background) we would like to consider a functional $\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}$ on the space $\mathrm{PSH}(X,\theta_0)\cap L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}\times\cdots\times\mathrm{PSH}(X,\theta_n)\cap L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}$ $(n+1$ times) that is

[2]By a standard abuse of notation we identify a Hermitian metric h with its associated $(1,1)$-form $\omega=\omega_h$ and refer to ω as the "metric".

- symmetric, i.e. for any permutation σ of the set $\{0,1,\dots,n\}$, we have
$$\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_{\sigma(0)},\dots,\theta_{\sigma(n)})}(\varphi_{\sigma(0)},\dots,\varphi_{\sigma(n)}) = \mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}(\varphi_0,\dots,\varphi_n).$$
- if φ_0' is another θ_i-psh function in $\mathrm{PSH}(X,\theta)\cap L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}$, then we have a 'change of function' property
$$\mathrm{E}(\varphi_0',\varphi_1\dots,\varphi_n) - \mathrm{E}(\varphi_0,\varphi_1\dots,\varphi_n) =$$
$$\int_X (\varphi_0'-\varphi_0)\ (\omega_1+dd^c\varphi_1)\wedge\cdots\wedge(\omega_n+dd^c\varphi_n).$$

Demanding that the above properties hold necessarily leads to the following definition.

Definition 2.1. *Let $\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n$ be closed $(1,1)$-forms on X. Define a* multivariate energy functional $\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}$ *on the space* $\mathrm{PSH}(X,\theta_0)\cap L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}\times\cdots\times\mathrm{PSH}(X,\theta_n)\cap L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}$ $(n+1$ times$)$ *by*

$$\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}(\varphi_0,\dots,\varphi_n) := \int_X \varphi_0\ (\theta_1+dd^c\varphi_1)\wedge\cdots\wedge(\theta_n+dd^c\varphi_n)$$
$$+\int_X \varphi_1\ \theta_0\wedge(\theta_2+dd^c\varphi_2)\wedge\cdots\wedge(\theta+dd^c\varphi_n)+\cdots+\int_X\varphi_n\ \theta_0\wedge\cdots\wedge\theta_{n-1}.$$

Remark 2.2. Seeing that this functional is symmetric results from integration by parts.

Remark 2.3. The multivariate energy functional $E_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}$ can also be defined on $\mathcal{C}^\infty(X)\times\cdots\times\mathcal{C}^\infty(X)$ by the same formula. In Sections 4 and 5 it will be interesting to consider both the smooth case and the case of locally bounded θ_i-psh functions.

Note that the above two functionals occur as special cases of the multivariate energy. Indeed, if θ is a closed $(1,1)$-form on X, ω is a Kähler form on X and φ is an ω-psh function on X, then

$$\mathrm{E}_\omega(\varphi) = \frac{1}{n+1}V^{-1}\mathrm{E}_{(\omega,\dots,\omega)}(\varphi,\dots,\varphi)$$

and

$$\mathrm{E}^\theta_\omega(\varphi) = \frac{1}{n}V^{-1}E_{(\theta,\omega,\dots,\omega)}(0,\varphi,\dots,\varphi).$$

2.2. **Subgeodesic rays.** Let $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}\subset\mathrm{PSH}(X,\omega)$ be a ray of ω-psh functions. Following a useful point of view of Donaldson [Don02] and Semmes [Sem92], there is a basic correspondence between the family $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq0}$ and an associated S^1-invariant function Φ on $X\times\bar\Delta^*$, where $\bar\Delta^*\subset\mathbb{C}$ denotes the pointed unit disc. We denote by τ the coordinate on Δ. Explicitly, the correspondence is given by

$$\Phi(x,e^{-t+is}) = \varphi^t(x),$$

where the sign is chosen so that $t\to+\infty$ corresponds to $\tau := e^{-t+is}\to 0$. The function Φ restricted to a fiber $X\times\{\tau\}$ thus corresponds precisely to φ_t on X. In the direction of the fibers we thus have $p_1^*\omega+dd^c_x\Phi\geq 0$ (in the sense of currents, letting $p_1: X\times\Delta\to X$ denote the first projection).

We will use the following standard terminology, motivated by the extensive study of (weak) geodesics in the space $\mathcal{H}$, see e.g. [Blo13], [Che00b], [Dar14], [Don02], [Sem92].

Definition 2.4. *We say that* $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *is a* subgeodesic ray *if the associated* S^1*-invariant function* Φ *on* $X\times\bar{\Delta}^*$ *is* $p_1^*\omega$*-psh. Furthermore, a locally bounded family of functions* $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *in* $\mathrm{PSH}(X,\omega)$ *is said to be a* weak geodesic ray *if the associated* S^1*-invariant function* $\Phi\in\mathrm{PSH}(X\times\bar{\Delta}^*,p_1^*\omega)$ *satisfies*

$$(p_1^*\omega+dd^c_{(x,\tau)}\Phi)^{n+1}=0$$

on $X\times\Delta^*$.

Definition 2.5. *Viewing the family* $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *as a map* $(0,+\infty)\to\mathrm{PSH}(X,\omega)$*, we say that* $(\varphi^t)_{t\geq 0}$ *is* continuous (resp. locally bounded, smooth) *if the corresponding* S^1*-invariant function* Φ *is continuous* (*resp. locally bounded, smooth*).

In [Che00b] Chen showed existence of geodesics with bounded Laplacian, see also e.g. [Blo13], [Dar14], [DL12]. We will refer to such a geodesic as being $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$*-regular*, cf. Lemma 4.4 below.

Definition 2.6. *We say that a function* φ *is* $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-regular *if* $dd^c\varphi\in L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}$*, and we set* $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}:=\mathrm{PSH}(X,\omega)\cap\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Recall that a $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-regular function is automatically $\mathcal{C}^{1,a}$-regular for all $0<a<1$. On the other hand, this condition is weaker than $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$-regularity (i.e. bounded real Hessian).

2.3. **Second order variation formulas.** We have the following identity for the second order variations of the multivariate energy functional $\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}$.

Proposition 2.7. *Let* $\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n$ *be closed* $(1,1)$*-forms on* X *and let* $(\varphi_i^t)_{t\geq 0}$ *be a smooth ray of smooth functions. Let* $\tau:=e^{-t+is}$ *and consider the reparametrised ray* $(\varphi_i^\tau)_{\tau\in\bar{\Delta}^*}$*. Denoting by* Φ_i *the corresponding* S^1*-invariant function on* $X\times\Delta^*$*, we have*

$$dd^c_\tau\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}(\varphi_0^\tau,\dots,\varphi_n^\tau)=\int_X(p_1^*\theta_0+dd^c_{(x,\tau)}\Phi_0)\wedge\cdots\wedge(p_1^*\theta_n+dd^c_{(x,\tau)}\Phi_n)$$

$$=(p_2)_*\left((p_1^*\theta_0+dd^c_{(x,\tau)}\Phi_0)\wedge\cdots\wedge(p_1^*\theta_n+dd^c_{(x,\tau)}\Phi_n)\right),$$

where $p_2:X\times\Delta^*\to\Delta^*$ *denotes the projection on the second factor and* $\int_X$ *denotes fiber integration, i.e. pushforward of currents.*

Proof. The result follows from a computation relying on integration by parts and is an immediate adaptation of for instance [BBGZ13, Proposition 6.2]. □

As a particular case of the above, we obtain the familiar formulas for the second order variation of E and E^θ, given by

$$dd^c_\tau\mathrm{E}(\varphi_\tau)=\frac{1}{n+1}V^{-1}\int_X(p_1^*\omega+dd^c_{(x,\tau)}\Phi)^{n+1}$$

and

$$dd^c_\tau\mathrm{E}^\theta(\varphi_\tau)=\frac{1}{n}V^{-1}\int_X(p_1^*\omega+dd^c_{(x,\tau)}\Phi)^n\wedge\theta$$

respectively. In particular, note that $\mathrm{E}(\varphi_\tau):=\mathrm{E}\circ\Phi$ is a subharmonic function on $\bar{\Delta}^*$. The function $t\mapsto\mathrm{E}(\varphi^\tau)$ is *affine* along weak geodesics, and *convex* along subgeodesics.

2.4. **The K-energy and the Chen-Tian formula.** Let ω be a Kähler form on X and consider any path $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ in the space $\mathcal{H}$ of Kähler potentials on X. The *Mabuchi functional* (or *K-energy*) $\mathrm{M} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ is then defined by its Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t) = V^{-1}\int_X \dot{\varphi}_t(\mathcal{S}(\omega_{\varphi_t}) - \bar{\mathcal{S}})\,\omega_{\varphi_t}^n$$

It is indeed independent of the path chosen and the critical points of the Mabuchi functional are precisely the cscK metrics, when they exist. By *the Chen-Tian formula* [Che00a] it is possible to write the Mabuchi functional as a sum of an "energy" and an "entropy" part. More precisely, we have

$$\mathrm{M}(\varphi) = \Big(\bar{\mathcal{S}}\mathrm{E}(\varphi) - \mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{Ric}(\omega)}(\varphi)\Big) + \mathrm{H}(\varphi), \tag{5}$$

where the latter term is the *entropy* of the probability measure $\mu := \omega_\varphi^n/V$ with respect to the reference measure $\mu_0 := \omega^n/V$. Recall that, if $\mu = f\mu_0$ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ_0, then this quantity is given by the expression

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mu_0}(\mu) := \int_X (f\log f)\,\mu_0,$$

which takes values in $[0, +\infty]$ and is finite if f is bounded. The entropy can be seen to be always lower semi-continuous (lsc) in μ.

Following Chen [Che00a] (using the formula (5)) we will work with the extension $\mathrm{M} : \mathcal{H}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathbb{R}$ of the Mabuchi functional to the space of ω-psh functions with bounded Laplacian. This is a natural setting to consider, since weak geodesic rays with bounded Laplacian are known to always exist, cf. [Che00b, Blo13, Dar14, DL12] as well as Lemma 4.4.

We further recall that the Mabuchi functional is convex along weak geodesic rays, as was recently established by [BB15], see also [CLP14]. As a consequence of this convexity, the Mabuchi functional is bounded from below (in the given Kähler class) whenever α contains a cscK metric, see [Don05b], [Li11] for a proof in the polarised case and [BB15] for the general Kähler setting.

3. Cohomological test configurations and K-semistability

In this section we introduce a natural generalised notion of test configurations and K-semistability of (X, α) that makes sense even when the class $\alpha \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ is non-integral (or non-rational), i.e. when α is not necessarily of the form $c_1(L)$ for some ample ($\mathbb{Q}$)-line bundle L on X. As remarked by Berman in [Ber13], it is natural to generalise the notion of test configuration in terms of cohomology classes. In the polarised setting the idea is to consider $(\mathcal{X}, c_1(\mathcal{L}))$ as a "test configuration" for $(X, c_1(L))$, by simply replacing $\mathcal{L}$ and L with their respective first Chern classes. This approach is motivated in detail below. Moreover, a number of basic and useful properties will be established, and throughout, this generalisation will systematically be compared to the original notion of algebraic test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for (X, L), introduced by Donaldson in [Don02].

Much of the following exposition goes through even when the cohomology class α is not Kähler. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, we thus assume that $\alpha = [\theta]$ for some closed $(1,1)$-form θ on X.

3.1. **Test configurations for X.** We first introduce the notion of test configuration $\mathcal{X}$ for X, working directly over $\mathbb{P}^1$. For the sake of comparison, recall the usual concept of test configuration for polarised manifolds, see e.g. [BHJ15] and [Sze14]. In what follows, we refer to [Fis76] for background on normal complex spaces.

Definition 3.1. *A* test configuration $\mathcal{X}$ for X *consists of*

- *a normal* compact *Kähler complex space $\mathcal{X}$ with a flat* (i.e. surjective) *morphism $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{P}^1$*
- *a $\mathbb{C}^*$-action λ on $\mathcal{X}$ lifting the canonical action on $\mathbb{P}^1$*
- *a $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 \simeq X \times (\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0\}). \tag{6}$$

The isomorphism 6 gives an open embedding of $X \times (\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0\})$ into $\mathcal{X}$, hence induces a canonical $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant bimeromorphic map $\mu : \mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. We say that $\mathcal{X}$ dominates $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ if the above bimeromorphic map μ is a morphism. Taking $\mathcal{X}'$ to be the normalisation of the graph of $\mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ we obtain a $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant bimeromorphic morphism $\rho : \mathcal{X}' \to \mathcal{X}$ with $\mathcal{X}'$ normal and dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. In the terminology of [BHJ15] such a morphism ρ is called a *determination* of $\mathcal{X}$. In particular, a determination of $\mathcal{X}$ always exists. By the above considerations we will often, up to replacing $\mathcal{X}$ by $\mathcal{X}'$, be able to assume that the given test configuration for X dominates $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Moreover, any test configuration $\mathcal{X}$ for X can be dominated by a smooth test configuration $\mathcal{X}'$ for X (where we may even assume that $\mathcal{X}'_0$ is a divisor of simple normal crossings). Indeed, by Hironaka (see [Kol07, Theorem 45] for the precise statement concerning normal complex spaces) there is a $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant proper bimeromorphic map $\mu : \mathcal{X}' \to \mathcal{X}$, with $\mathcal{X}'$ smooth, such that $\mathcal{X}'_0$ has simple normal crossings and μ is an isomorphism outside of the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$.

As a further consequence of the isomorphism (6), note that if Φ is a function on $\mathcal{X}$, then its restriction to each fibre $\mathcal{X}_\tau \simeq X$, $\tau \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0\}$ identifies with a function on X. The function Φ thus gives rise to a family of functions $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on X, recalling our convention of reparametrising so that $t := -\log|\tau|$.

Remark 3.2. When X is projective (hence algebraic), the GAGA principle shows that the usual (i.e. algebraic, and normal) test configurations of X correspond precisely to the test configurations (in our sense of Definition 3.1) with $\mathcal{X}$ projective.

3.2. **Cohomological test configurations for (X, α).** We now introduce a natural generalisation of the usual notion of *algebraic test configuration* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for a polarised manifold (X, L). This following definition involves the Bott-Chern cohomology on normal complex spaces, i.e. the space of locally dd^c-exact $(1,1)$-forms (or currents) modulo globally dd^c-exact $(1,1)$-forms (or currents). The Bott-Chern cohomology is finite dimensional and the cohomology classes can be pulled back. Moreover, $H^{1,1}_{\mathrm{BC}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R})$ coincides with the usual Dolbeault cohomology $H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R})$ whenever $\mathcal{X}$ is smooth. See e.g. [BG13] for background.

Definition 3.3. *A* cohomological test configuration for (X, α) *is a pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ where $\mathcal{X}$ is a test configuration for X and $\mathcal{A} \in H^{1,1}_{\mathrm{BC}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{C}^*}$ is a $\mathbb{C}^*$-invariant $(1,1)-$Bott-Chern cohomology class whose image under the $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 \simeq X \times (\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0\}).$$

is $p_1^*\alpha$. Here $p_1 : X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \to X$ is the first projection.

Definition 3.4. *We say that a test configuration* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ *for* (X, α) *is* smooth *if the total space* $\mathcal{X}$ *is smooth. In case* $\alpha \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ *is Kähler, we say that* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ *is* relatively Kähler *if the cohomology class* $\mathcal{A}$ *is relatively Kähler, i.e. there is a Kähler form* β *on* $\mathbb{P}^1$ *such that* $\mathcal{A} + \pi^*\beta$ *is Kähler on* $\mathcal{X}$*.*

Exploiting the discussion superceding Definition 3.1, we *in practice* restrict attention to the situation when $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ is a smooth (cohomological) test configuration for (X, α) dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, with $\mu : \mathcal{X} \to X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ the corresponding $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant bimeromorphic morphism. This situation is studied in detail in Section 3.4, where we in particular show that the class $\mathcal{A} \in H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R})$ is always of the form $\mathcal{A} = \mu^* p_1^* \alpha + [D]$ for a unique $\mathbb{R}$-divisor D supported on the central fiber, cf. Proposition 3.8.

It is further natural to ask how the above notion of cohomological test configurations compares to the algebraic test configurations introduced by Donaldson in [Don02]. On the one hand, if $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L})$ is an algebraic test configuration for (X, L), then $(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}, c_1(\mathcal{L}))$ of $(X, c_1(L))$ is a cohomological test configuration, canonically induced by the test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L})$ for (X, L).

On the other hand, there is no converse such correspondence; For instance, if (X, L) is a polarised manifold, then there are more cohomological test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ for $(X, c_1(L))$ than algebraic test configurations $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L})$ for (X, L). However, we show in Proposition 3.12 that such considerations are not an issue in the study of K-semistability of (X, α).

3.3. **The generalised Donaldson-Futaki invariant and K-semistability.** The following generalisation of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant is straightforward.

Definition 3.5. *Let* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ *be a cohomological test configuration for* (X, α)*. The Donaldson-Futaki invariant of* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ *is*

$$\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) := \frac{\bar{S}}{n+1} V^{-1} (\mathcal{A}^{n+1})_{\mathcal{X}} + V^{-1} (K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1} \cdot \mathcal{A}^n)_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

We recall that $\mathcal{X}$ is assumed to be *compact*, cf. Definition 3.1, and that $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1} := K_{\mathcal{X}} - \pi^* K_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ denotes the relative canonical divisor. The point is that by results of Wang [Wan12] and Odaka [Oda13] $\mathrm{DF}(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}, c_1(\mathcal{L}))$ coincides with $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L})$ whenever $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L})$ is an algebraic test configuration for a polarised manifold (X, L), with $\mathcal{Y}$ normal (see the proof of Proposition 3.12). Hence the above quantity is a generalisation of the classical Donaldson-Futaki invariant.

The analogue of K-semistability in the context of cohomological test configurations is defined as follows.

Definition 3.6. *We say that* (X, α) *is* K-semistable *if* $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) \geq 0$ *for all relatively Kähler test configurations* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ *for* (X, α)*.*

Remark 3.7. With the study of K-semistability in mind, we emphasise that the Donaldson-Futaki invariant $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L})$ (cf. [Wan12, Oda13]) depends only on $\mathcal{Y}$ and $c_1(\mathcal{L})$. The notion of cohomological test configuration emphasises this fact.

In order to further motivate the above definitions, we now introduce a number of related concepts and basic properties that will be useful in the sequel.

3.4. **Test configurations characterised by $\mathbb{R}$-divisors.** Recall that if $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is an algebraic test configuration for a polarised manifold (X, L) that dominates $(X, L) \times \mathbb{C}$, then $\mathcal{L} = \mu^* p_1^* L + D$ for a unique $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor D supported on $\mathcal{X}_0$, see [BHJ15]. Similarily, the following result characterises the classes $\mathcal{A}$ associated to smooth and dominating cohomological test configurations, in terms of $\mathbb{R}$-divisors D supported on the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a smooth cohomological test configuration for (X, α) dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, with $\mu : \mathcal{X} \to X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ the corresponding canonical $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant bimeromorphic morphism. Then there exists a unique $\mathbb{R}$-divisor D supported on the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{A} = \mu^* p_1^* \alpha + [D]$$

in $H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R})$.

Proof. Let $\alpha := [\omega] \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$. We begin by proving existence: By hypothesis $\mathcal{X}$ dominates $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ via the morphism $\mu :\to X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, such that the central fiber decomposes into the strict transform of $X \times \{0\}$ and the μ-exceptional divisor. We write $\mathcal{X}_0 = \sum_i b_i E_i$, with E_i irreducible. Denoting by $[E]$ the cohomology class of E and by $p_1 : X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \to X$ the projection on the first factor, we then have the following formula:

Lemma 3.9. $H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}) = \mu^* p_1^* H^{1,1}(X) \oplus \bigoplus_i \mathbb{R}[E_i]$.

Proof. Let Θ be a closed $(1,1)$-form on $\mathcal{X}$. Then $T := \Theta - \mu^*(\mu_* \Theta)$ is a closed $(1,1)$-current of order 0 supported on $\cup_i E_i = \mathrm{Exc}(\mu)$. By Demailly's second theorem of support (see [Dem12]) it follows that $T = \sum_i \lambda_i \delta_{E_j}$ and hence $[\Theta] = \mu^*(\mu_*[\Theta]) + \sum_i \lambda_i [E_i]$ in $H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X})$.

Since $H^{1,1}(\mathbb{P}^1)$ is generated by $[0]$, we have $p_2^* H^{1,1}(\mathbb{P}^1) = \mathbb{R}[X \times \{0\}]$. By the Künneth formula, it thus follows that $H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}) = \mu^* p_1^* H^{1,1}(X) \oplus \mu^*(\mathbb{R}[X \times \{0\}]) \oplus \bigoplus_i \mathbb{R}[E_i]$. □

If we decompose $\mathcal{A}$ accordingly we obtain $\mathcal{A} = \mu^* p_1^* \eta + [D]$ with $D := \mu^*(c[X \times \{0\}]) + \bigoplus_i b_i [E_i]$ and η a class in $H^{1,1}(X)$. The restrictions of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mu^* p_1^* \alpha$ to $\pi^{-1}(1) \simeq X \times \{1\} \simeq X$ are identified with with α and η respectively. Since D is supported on $\mathcal{X}_0$ it follows that $\eta = \alpha$. We thus have the sought decomposition, proving existence.

As for the uniqueness, we let $\mathcal{D}_0$ be the set of of $\mathbb{R}$-divisors D with support contained in the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$. Consider the linear map

$$R : \mathcal{D}_0 \to H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X})$$

$$D \mapsto [D]$$

The desired uniqueness property is equivalent to injectivity of R. To this end, assume that $[D] = 0$ in $H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X})$. In particular $D_{|E_i} \equiv 0$ and it follows from a corollary of Zariski's lemma (see e.g. [BHPdV04, Lemma 8.2]) that $D = c\mathcal{X}_0$, with $c \in \mathbb{R}$. But, letting β be any Kähler form on X, we see from the projection formula that

$$(\mathcal{X}_0 \cdot (\mu^* p_1^* \beta)^n)_{\mathcal{X}} = ((X \times \{0\}) \cdot (p_1^* \beta)^n)_{X \times \mathbb{P}^1} = \beta^n = V > 0,$$

since V is the Kähler volume. Hence $[\mathcal{X}_0]$ is a non-zero class in $H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X})$. It follows that $c = 0$, thus $D = 0$ as well. We are done. □

This gives a very convenient characterisation of smooth cohomological test configurations for (X,α) that dominate $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$.

In what follows, we will make use of resolution of singularities to associate a new test configuration $(\mathcal{X}',\mathcal{A}')$ for (X,α) to a given one, noting that this can be done *without changing the Donaldson-Futaki invariant*. Indeed, by Hironaka [Kol07, Theorem 45] (see also Section 3.1) there is a $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant proper bimeromorphic map $\mu:\mathcal{X}'\to\mathcal{X}$, with $\mathcal{X}'$ smooth and such that $\mathcal{X}'_0$ has simple normal crossings. Moreover, μ is an isomorphism outside of the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$. Set $\mathcal{A}':=\mu^*\mathcal{A}$. By the projection formula we then have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}',\mathcal{A}') &= \frac{\bar{S}}{n+1}V^{-1}((\mathcal{A}')^{n+1})_{\mathcal{X}'}+V^{-1}(K_{\mathcal{X}'/\mathbb{P}^1}\cdot(\mathcal{A}')^n)_{\mathcal{X}'}\\ &= \frac{\bar{S}}{n+1}V^{-1}(\mathcal{A}^{n+1})_{\mathcal{X}}+V^{-1}(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}\cdot\mathcal{A}^n)_{\mathcal{X}}=\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A}).\end{aligned}$$

The following result states that it suffices to test K-semistability for a certain class of cohomological test configurations 'characterised by an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor' (in the above sense of Proposition 3.8).

Proposition 3.10. *Let $\alpha\in H^{1,1}(X,\mathbb{R})$ be Kähler. Then (X,α) is K-semistable* (in the sense of Definition 3.6) *if and only if* $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})\geq 0$ *for all smooth, relatively Kähler cohomological test configurations $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ for (X,α) dominating $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$.*

Proof. Let $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ be any cohomological test configuration for (X,α) that is relatively Kähler. By Hironaka (see [Kol07]) there is a sequence of blow ups $\rho:\mathcal{X}'\to X\times\mathbb{P}^1$ with smooth $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant centers such that $\mathcal{X}'$ simultaneously dominates $\mathcal{X}$ and $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$ via morphisms μ and ρ respectively. Moreover, there is a divisor E on $\mathcal{X}'$ that is ρ-exceptional and ρ-ample (and antieffective, i.e. $-E$ is effective). By Proposition 3.8, we have

$$\mu^*\mathcal{A}=\rho^*p_1^*\alpha+[D],$$

where D is an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor on $\mathcal{X}'$ supported on $\mathcal{X}'_0$. Note that the class $\mu^*\mathcal{A}\in H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}',\mathbb{R})$ is relatively nef.

We proceed by perturbation; Since α is Kähler on X, we may pick a Kähler class η on $\mathbb{P}^1$ such that $p_1^*\alpha+p_2^*\eta=:\beta$ is Kähler on $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. Since E is ρ-ample one may in turn fix an $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$ sufficiently small such that $\rho^*\beta+\varepsilon[E]$ is Kähler on $\mathcal{X}'$. It follows that $\rho^*p_1^*\alpha+\varepsilon[E]$ is *relatively* Kähler (with respect to $\mathbb{P}^1$) on $\mathcal{X}'$. Thus $\rho^*p_1^*\alpha+[D]+\delta(\rho^*p_1^*\alpha+\varepsilon[E])$ is relatively Kähler for all $\delta\geq 0$ small enough. In turn, so is $\mathcal{A}'_\delta:=\rho^*p_1^*\alpha+[D_\delta]$, where D_δ denotes the convex combination $D_\delta:=\frac{1}{1+\delta}D+\frac{\delta\varepsilon}{1+\delta}E$. Assuming that the DF-invariant of a smooth and dominating test configuration is always non-negative, it follows from the projection formula and continuity of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant, that

$$0\leq\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}',\mathcal{A}'_\delta)\longrightarrow\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}',\mu^*\mathcal{A})=\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A}).$$

as $\delta\to 0$. The other direction holds by definition, so this proves the lemma. □

Remark 3.11. With respect to testing K-semistability one can in fact restrict the class of test configurations that need to be considered even further, as explained in Section 3.6.

3.5. **Cohomological K-semistability for polarised manifolds.** It is useful to compare cohomological- and algebraic K-semistability in the special case of a polarised manifold (X, L).

Proposition 3.12. *Let (X, L) be a polarised manifold and let $\alpha := c_1(L)$. Then $(X, c_1(L))$ is* (cohomologically) *K-semistable if and only if (X, L) is* (algebraically) *K-semistable.*

Proof. Suppose that $(X, c_1(L))$ is cohomologically K-semistable. If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is an ample test configuration for (X, L), let $\mathcal{A} := c_1(\bar{\mathcal{L}})$. By the intersection theoretic characterisation of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant (Definition 3.5) we then have $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) = \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$. Hence (X, L) is algebraically K-semistable.

Conversely, suppose that (X, L) is algebraically K-semistable and let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a cohomological test configuration for (X, α). By Lemma 3.10 we may assume that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ is a smooth, relatively Kähler test configuration for (X, α) dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, with $\mu :\to X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ the corresponding $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant bimeromorphic morphism. By Proposition 3.8 we further have $\mathcal{A} = \mu^* p_1^* c_1(L) + [D]$ for a uniquely determined $\mathbb{R}$-divisor D on $\mathcal{X}$ supported on the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is relatively Kähler, there is a Kähler form η on $\mathbb{P}^1$ such that $\mathcal{A} + \pi^*\eta$ is Kähler on $\mathcal{X}$. Approximating the coefficients of the divisor D by a sequence of rationals, we write $D = \lim D_j$ for $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors D_j on $\mathcal{X}$, all supported on $\mathcal{X}_0$. As $j \to +\infty$, we then have

$$\mu^* p_1^* c_1(L) + [D_j] + \pi^*\eta \longrightarrow \mathcal{A} + \pi^*\eta,$$

which is a Kähler form on $\mathcal{X}$. Since the Kähler cone is open, it follows that $\mu^* p_1^* c_1(L) + [D_j] + \pi^*\eta$ is also Kähler for all j large enough.

Now let $\mathcal{L}_j := \mu^* p_1^* L + D_j$. By the above, $\mathcal{L}_j$ is a relatively ample $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle over $\mathcal{X}$ and $c_1(\mathcal{L}_j) \to \mathcal{A}$. We thus conclude that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}_j)$ (for all j large enough) is an ample test configuration for (X, L). Hence

$$0 \leq \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}_j) \longrightarrow \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}).$$

as $j \to +\infty$, which is what we wanted to prove. □

3.6. **The non-Archimedean Mabuchi functional and base change.** Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a cohomological test configuration for (X, α). A natural operation on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ is that of *base change* (on $\mathcal{X}$ and we pull back $\mathcal{A}$). Unlike resolution of singularities, however, the DF-invariant does not behave well under under base change. In this context, a more natural object of study is instead the *non-Archimedean Mabuchi functional* M^{NA} (first introduced in [BHJ16] and [BHJ15], where also an explanation of the terminology is given).

Definition 3.13. *The* non-Archimedean Mabuchi functional *is the modification of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant given by*

$$\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) := \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) + V^{-1}((\mathcal{X}_{0,\mathrm{red}} - \mathcal{X}_0) \cdot \mathcal{A}^n)_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Note that the 'correction term' $V^{-1}((\mathcal{X}_{0,\mathrm{red}} - \mathcal{X}_0) \cdot \mathcal{A}^n)_{\mathcal{X}}$ is non-positive and vanishes precisely when the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$ is reduced. The point of adding to DF this additional term is that the resulting quantity $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ becomes *homogeneous under base change*, i.e. we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.14. ([BHJ15]) *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a cohomological test configuration for (X, α) and let $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote by $\mathcal{X}_d$ the normalisation of the base change of $\mathcal{X}$, by $g_d : \mathcal{X}_d \to \mathcal{X}$ the corresponding morphism* (of degree d) *and set $\mathcal{A}_d := g_d^* \mathcal{A}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}_d, \mathcal{A}_d) = d \cdot \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}).$$

Proof. We refer the reader to [BHJ15, Proposition 7.13], whose proof goes through in the analytic case as well. □

As an application, it follows from Mumford's semistable reduction theorem ([KKMSD73, p.53], see also [KNX15, §16, p.6] for a remark on the analytic case) that there is a $d \in \mathbb{N}$, a finite base change $f : \tau \mapsto \tau^d$ (for d 'divisible enough'), a smooth test configuration $\mathcal{X}'$ and a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{X} & \xleftarrow{g_d} & \mathcal{X}_d & \xleftarrow{\rho} & \mathcal{X}' \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_d} & \swarrow{\scriptstyle \pi'} & \\ \mathbb{P}^1 & \xleftarrow[f]{} & \mathbb{P}^1 & & \end{array}$$

such that $\mathcal{X}'$ is semistable, i.e. smooth and such that $\mathcal{X}'_0$ is a reduced divisor with simple normal crossings. In particular, note that the correction term $V^{-1}((\mathcal{X}'_{0,\mathrm{red}} - \mathcal{X}'_0) \cdot \mathcal{A}'^n)_{\mathcal{X}'}$ vanishes. Here $\mathcal{X}_d$ denotes the normalisation of the base change, which is dominated by the semistable test configuration $\mathcal{X}'$ for X. Moreover, $g_d \circ \rho$ is an isomorphism over $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0\}$.

Letting $\mathcal{A}_d := g_d^* \mathcal{A}$ be the pullback of $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{X}_d$, and $\mathcal{A}' := \rho^* \mathcal{A}_d$ the pullback to $\mathcal{X}'$, it follows from the above homogeneity of the M^{NA} that

$$\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{A}') = \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{A}') = \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}_d, \mathcal{A}_d) = d \cdot \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) \leq d \cdot \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}),$$

where d is the degree of g_d. We have thus associated to $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ a new test configuration $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{A}')$ for (X, α) such that the total space $\mathcal{X}'$ is semistable. Up to replacing $\mathcal{X}'$ with a *determination* (see Section 3.1) we can moreover assume that $\mathcal{X}'$ dominates $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Hence, the above shows that $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) \geq \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{A}')$. By an argument by perturbation much as the one in the proof of Proposition 3.10, we obtain the following stronger version of the aforementioned result.

Proposition 3.15. *Let $\alpha \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ be Kähler. Then (X, α) is K-semistable* (Definition 3.6) *if and only if $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) \geq 0$ for all semistable, relatively Kähler cohomological test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ for (X, α) dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$.*

4. Transcendental Kempf-Ness type formulas

Let X be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension n and let θ_i, $0 \leq i \leq n$, be closed $(1,1)$-forms on X. Let $\alpha_i := [\theta_i] \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ be the corresponding cohomology classes. Consider smooth cohomological test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{A}_i)$ for (X, α_i) dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, with $\mu_i : \mathcal{X}_i \to X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ the corresponding $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant bimeromorphic morphisms respectively.

In this section we aim to prove Theorem B. In other words, we establish a Kempf-Ness type formula (for *cohomological* test configurations), which connects the asymptotic slope of the multivariate energy functional $\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0, \ldots, \theta_n)}(\varphi_0^t, \ldots, \varphi_n^t)$ (see Definition 2.1) with a certain intersection number. In order for such a result to

hold, we need to ask that the rays $(\varphi_i^t)_{t\geq 0}$ are *compatible* with $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{A}_i)$ in a sense that has to do with extension across the central fiber, see Section 4.1 below.

For what follows, note that, by equivariant resolution of singularities, there is a test configuration $\mathcal{X}$ for X which is smooth and dominates $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. This setup comes with canonical $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant bimeromorphic maps $\rho_i : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}_i$ respectively. In particular, we may *define* the intersection number

$$(\mathcal{A}_0 \cdot \cdots \cdot \mathcal{A}_n) := (\rho_0^* \mathcal{A}_0 \cdot \cdots \cdot \rho_n^* \mathcal{A}_n)_{\mathcal{X}} \tag{7}$$

by means of pulling back the respective cohomology classes to $\mathcal{X}$.

4.1. **Compatibility conditions.** Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a smooth (cohomological) test configuration for (X, α) dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, with $\mu : \mathcal{X} \to X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ the corresponding canonical $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant bimeromorphic morphism. We then have

$$\mathcal{A} = \mu^* p_1^* \alpha + [D]$$

for a unique $\mathbb{R}$-divisor D supported on $\mathcal{X}_0$, with $p_1 : X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \to X$ denoting the first projection, cf. Proposition 3.8.

We fix the choice of an S^1-invariant function 'Green function' ψ_D for D, so that $\delta_D = \theta_D + dd^c \psi_D$ with θ_D a smooth S^1-invariant closed $(1,1)$-form on $\mathcal{X}$. Locally, we thus have

$$\psi_D = \sum_j a_j \log |f_j| \mod \mathcal{C}^\infty,$$

where (writing $D := \sum_j a_j D_j$ for the decomposition of D into irreducible components) the f_j are local defining equations for the D_j respectively. In particular, the choice of ψ_D is uniquely determined modulo a smooth function.

In the following paragraphs we discuss subgeodesic rays $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ on X, which we recall are in correspondence with S^1-invariant functions Φ on $X \times \bar{\Delta}^*$. In the proof of Theorem B, it will be important to extend the Φ across the central fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$. To this end, we introduce the notions of $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-, L^∞- and $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatibility between the ray $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and the test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$.

The purpose of introducing more than one version of compatibility is that we will distuingish between the following two situations of interest to us.

(1) smooth but not necessarily subgeodesic rays (φ_t) that are $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible with the smooth test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ for (X, α), dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Here we can consider $\alpha = [\theta] \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ for any closed $(1,1)$-form θ on X.

(2) locally bounded *subgeodesic* rays (φ_t) that are L^∞-compatible or (more restrictively) $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible with the given smooth and *relatively Kähler* test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ for (X, α), dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Here we thus suppose that α is a Kähler class.

Theorem B has valid formulations in both these situations, as pointed out in Remark 4.8. The second situation is interesting notably with weak geodesic rays in mind, cf. Section 4.3.

4.2. **$\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible rays.** With the situation (1) in mind, we first introduce the notion of smooth (not necessarily subgeodesic) rays that are $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-*compatible* with the given test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ for (X, α).

Definition 4.1. *Let $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a smooth ray in $\mathcal{C}^\infty(X)$, and denote by Φ the corresponding smooth S^1-invariant function on $X \times \bar{\Delta}^*$. We say that (φ_t) and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ are* $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible *if $\Phi \circ \mu + \psi_D$ extends smoothly across $\mathcal{X}_0$.*

The condition is indeed independent of the choice of ψ_D, as the latter is well-defined modulo a smooth function. In the case of a polarised manifold (X, L) with an (algebraic) test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ this condition amounts to demanding that the metric on $\mathcal{L}$ associated to the ray $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ extends smoothly across the central fiber.

We now establish the following existence of a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible ray associated to a given relatively Kähler test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ for (X, α).

Lemma 4.2. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is relatively Kähler, then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible with some smooth subgeodesic ray (φ_t).*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is relatively Kähler, it admits a smooth S^1-invariant representative Ω with $\Omega + \pi^*\eta > 0$ for some S^1-invariant Kähler form η on $\mathbb{P}^1$. By the dd^c-lemma on $\mathcal{X}$, we have $\Omega = \mu^* p_1^* \omega + \theta_D + dd^c u$ for some S^1-invariant $u \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X)$, which may be assumed to be 0 after replacing ψ_D with $\psi_D - u$. As a result, we get

$$\Omega = \mu^* p_1^* \omega + \delta_D - dd^c \psi_D.$$

We may also choose a smooth S^1-invariant function f on a neighborhood U of $\bar{\Delta}$ such that $\eta_{|U} = dd^c f$, and a constant $A \gg 1$ such that $D \leq A\mathcal{X}_0$. Using the Lelong-Poincaré formula $\delta_{\mathcal{X}_0} = dd^c \log|\tau|$ we get

$$0 < \Omega + \pi^*\eta = \mu^* p_1^* \omega + \delta_{D - A\mathcal{X}_0} + dd^c \left(f \circ \pi + A \log|\tau| - \psi_D \right)$$

on $\pi^{-1}(U)$. Since $D - A\mathcal{X}_0 \leq 0$, it follows that $f \circ \pi + A \log|\tau| - \psi_D$ is $\mu^* p_1^* \omega$-psh, and hence descends to an S^1-invariant $p_1^*\omega$-psh function $\tilde{\Phi}$ on $X \times U$ (because the fibers of μ are compact and connected, by Zariski's main theorem). The ray associated with the S^1-invariant function $\Phi := \tilde{\Phi} - A \log|\tau|$ has the desired properties. □

4.3. **$\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible rays and the weak geodesic ray associated to $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$.** As in situation (2), let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a smooth, relatively Kähler cohomological test configuration for (X, α) (with α Kähler). With this setup, we consider the following weaker compatibility conditions, referred to as L^∞-compatibility and $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatibility respectively.

Definition 4.3. *Let $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a locally bounded subgeodesic ray, and denote by Φ the corresponding S^1-invariant locally bounded $p_1^*\omega$-psh function on $X \times \bar{\Delta}^*$. We say that (φ_t) and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ are* L^∞-compatible *if $\Phi \circ \mu + \psi_D$ is locally bounded near $\mathcal{X}_0$, resp.* $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible *if $\Phi \circ \mu + \psi_D$ is of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$ on $\pi^{-1}(\Delta)$.*

The setting of $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatibility is interesting for instance with the particular case of weak geodesics in mind[3]. Indeed, we will see that $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatibility is always satisfied for weak geodesic rays associated to $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ (in particular, for any given

[3]Moreover, L^∞-compatibility is of course a weaker condition, which is often enough to establish the results of the remainder of the paper.

test configuration, $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible subgeodesics always exist). This is the content of the following result, which is a consequence of the theory for degenerate Monge-Ampère equations on manifolds with boundary. We refer the reader to [Bou12] for the relevant background.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a smooth, relatively Kähler cohomological test configuration of (X, α) dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ is $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible with some weak geodesic ray $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$.*

Remark 4.5. The proof will show that the constructed ray is actually unique, once a $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ is fixed.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Let $M := \pi^{-1}(\bar{\Delta}) \subset \mathcal{X}$. It is a smooth complex manifold with boundary $\partial M = \pi^{-1}(S^1)$.

Let D, θ_D, ψ_D and Ω be as above. Since Ω is relatively Kähler there is an $\eta \in H^{1,1}(\mathbb{P}^1)$ such that $\Omega + \pi^*\eta$ is Kähler on $\mathcal{X}$. We may then write $\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega + \pi^*\eta + dd^c g$, where $\tilde{\Omega}$ is a Kähler form on $\mathcal{X}$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{X})$. In a neighbourhood of $\bar{\Delta}$ the form η is further dd^c-exact, and so we write $\eta = dd^c(g' \circ \pi)$ for a smooth function $g' \circ \pi$ on $\bar{\Delta}$. We now consider the following degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equation;

$$(\star) \begin{cases} (\tilde{\Omega} + dd^c\tilde{\Psi})^{n+1} = 0 \ \text{ on } \mathrm{Int}(M) \\ \tilde{\Psi}_{|\partial M} = \varphi_0 + \psi_D - g' - g \end{cases}$$

Since $\tilde{\Omega}$ is Kähler, it follows that there exists a unique $\tilde{\Omega}$-psh function $\tilde{\Psi}$ solving $(\star)$ and that is moreover of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$ (see for instance [Bou12, Theorem B]. We now define a $p_1^*\omega$-psh function on $X \times \bar{\Delta}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ by $\mu^*\Phi = \tilde{\Psi} - \psi_D + g' + g$. We then have

$$\mu^*(p_1^*\omega + dd^c\Phi) = \tilde{\Omega} + dd^c\tilde{\Psi}$$

on $\pi^{-1}(\bar{\Delta}^*)$. In particular, Φ defines a weak geodesic ray $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ on X. Moreover, the current

$$\mu^* dd^c\Phi + \delta_D = dd^c\tilde{\Psi} + \delta_D - dd^c\psi_D = dd^c\tilde{\Psi} + \theta_D$$

has locally bounded coefficients. Indeed, $dd^c\tilde{\Psi} \in L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}$ (as solution of $(\star)$, cf. [Bou12]) and θ_D is a smooth $(1,1)$-form on $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$. The constructed ray is thus $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$. □

4.4. **A useful lemma.** In order to compute the asymptotic slope of the Monge-Ampère energy functional E or its multivariate analogue $\mathrm{E}_{(\omega_0,\dots,\omega_n)}$ we may in fact replace L^∞-compatible rays (φ^t) with $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ by $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible ones. Indeed, note that any two locally bounded subgeodesic rays (φ_t) and (φ'_t) L^∞-compatible with $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ satisfy $\Phi \circ \mu = \Phi' \circ \mu + O(1)$ near $\mathcal{X}_0$, and hence $\varphi_t = \varphi'_t + O(1)$ as $t \to +\infty$. This leads to the following observation, which will be useful in view of proving Theorems B and C.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{A}_i)$ be smooth, relatively Kähler cohomological test configurations for (X, α_i) respectively, dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Let $(\varphi_i^t)_{t\geq 0}$ and $({\varphi'}_i^t)_{t\geq 0}$ be locally bounded subgeodesics that are L^∞-compatible with $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{A}_i)$ respectively. Then*

$$\mathrm{E}_{(\omega_0,\dots,\omega_n)}(\varphi_0^t, \dots, \varphi_n^t) = \mathrm{E}_{(\omega_0,\dots,\omega_n)}({\varphi'}_0^t, \dots, {\varphi'}_n^t) + O(1)$$

as $t \to +\infty$.

Proof. For each i, $0 \leq i \leq n$, we have $\varphi_i^t = {\varphi'}_i^t + O(1)$ as $t \to +\infty$. Recall that the mass of the Bedford-Taylor product $\bigwedge(\omega_i + dd^c\varphi_i^t)$ is computed in cohomology, thus independent of t. Hence, the quantity

$$\mathrm{E}_{(\omega_0,\dots,\omega_n)}(\varphi_0^t,\varphi_1^t,\dots,\varphi_n^t) - \mathrm{E}_{(\omega_0,\dots,\omega_n)}({\varphi'}_0^t,\varphi_1^t,\dots,\varphi_n^t)$$
$$= \int_X (\varphi_0^t - {\varphi'}_0^t)(\omega_1 + dd^c\varphi_1^t) \wedge \cdots \wedge (\omega_n + dd^c\varphi_n^t)$$

is bounded as $t \to +\infty$. By symmetry, the argument may be repeated for the remaining i, yielding the result. □

4.5. **Proof of Theorem B.** With the above formalism in place, we are ready to formulate the main result of this section (Theorem B of the introduction). It constitutes the main contribution towards establishing Theorem A, and may be viewed as a transcendental analogue of Lemma 4.3 in [BHJ16]. We here formulate and prove the theorem in the 'smooth but not necessarily Kähler' setting (see Section 4.1, situation (1)). However, one should note that there is also a valid formulation for L^∞-compatible subgeodesics, as pointed out in Remark 4.8.

Theorem 4.7. *Let X be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension n and let θ_i, $0 \leq i \leq n$, be closed $(1,1)$-forms on X. Set $\alpha_i := [\theta_i] \in H^{1,1}(X,\mathbb{R})$. Consider smooth cohomological test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i,\mathcal{A}_i)$ for (X,α_i) dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. For each collection of smooth rays $(\varphi_i^t)_{t\geq 0}$ $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X}_i,\mathcal{A}_i)$ respectively, the asymptotic slope of the multivariate energy functional $E := E_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}$ is well-defined and satisfies*

$$\frac{\mathrm{E}(\varphi_0^t,\dots,\varphi_n^t)}{t} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{A}_0 \cdot \cdots \cdot \mathcal{A}_n)$$

as $t \to +\infty$. See (7) for the definition of the above intersection number.

Proof. Fix any smooth S^1-invariant $(1,1)$-forms Ω_i on $\mathcal{X}_i$ such that $[\Omega_i] = \mathcal{A}_i$ in $H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}_i,\mathbb{R})$. Let $(\varphi_i^t)_{t\geq 0}$ be smooth and $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X}_i,\mathcal{A}_i)$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a smooth test configuration that simultaneously dominates the $\mathcal{X}_i$. By pulling back to $\mathcal{X}$ we can assume that the $\mathcal{X}_i$ are all equal (note that the notion of being $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible is preserved under this pull-back).

In the notation of Section 4.1, the functions $\Phi_i \circ \mu + \psi_D$ are then smooth on the manifold with boundary $M := \pi^{-1}(\bar{\Delta})$, and may thus be written as the restriction of smooth S^1-invariant functions Ψ_i on $\mathcal{X}$ respectively.

Using the $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant isomorphism $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 \simeq X \times (\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0\})$ we view $(\Psi_i - \psi_D)_{|\mathcal{X}_\tau}$ as a function $\varphi_i^\tau \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X)$ to $X \times \{\tau\}$. By Proposition 2.7 we then have

$$dd^c\mathrm{E}(\varphi_0^\tau,\dots,\varphi_n^\tau) = \pi_*\left(\bigwedge_i(\Omega_i + dd^c\Psi_i)\right)$$

over $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0\}$, and the Green-Riesz formula yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}_{t=-\log\varepsilon}\mathrm{E}(\varphi_0^t,\dots,\varphi_n^t) = \int_{\mathbb{P}^1\setminus\Delta_\varepsilon}\mathrm{E}(\varphi_0^\tau,\dots,\varphi_n^\tau) =$$

$$\int_{\pi^{-1}(\mathbb{P}^1\setminus\Delta_\varepsilon)}\bigwedge_i(\Omega_i + dd^c\Psi_i),$$

which converges to $(\mathcal{A}_0 \cdot \cdots \cdot \mathcal{A}_n)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

For each closed $(1,1)$-form Θ on $\mathcal{X}$ and each smooth function Φ on $\mathcal{X}$, there is a Kähler form η on $\mathcal{X}$ and a constant C large enough so that $\Theta + C\eta + dd^c\Phi \geq 0$ on $\mathcal{X}$. Moreover, note that we have a relation

$$\mathrm{E}_{(\omega-\omega',\theta_1\ldots,\theta_n)}(\varphi_0^t,\varphi_1^t,\ldots,\varphi_n^t) =$$

$$\mathrm{E}_{(\omega,\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_n)}(\varphi_0^t,\varphi_1^t\ldots,\varphi_n^t) - \mathrm{E}_{(\omega',\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_n)}(0,\varphi_1^t\ldots,\varphi_n^t)$$

and repeat this argument for each i, $0 \leq i \leq n$, by symmetry. It follows from the above 'multilinearity' that we can write $t \mapsto E(\varphi_0^t,\ldots,\varphi_n^t)$ as a difference of convex functions. Hence

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{E}(\varphi_0^t,\ldots,\varphi_n^t)}{t} = \lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{E}(\varphi_0^t,\ldots,\varphi_n^t),$$

concluding the proof. □

Remark 4.8. The above proof in fact also yields a version of Theorem 4.7 for *subgeodesics* $(\varphi_i^t)_{t\geq 0}$ that are L^∞*-compatible* with smooth test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i,\mathcal{A}_i)$ for (X,α_i) dominating $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. This follows from the observation that one may replace L^∞-compatible subgeodesic rays with smooth $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible ones, using Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.6.

As a special case of Theorem B we obtain transcendental versions of several previously known formulas (see for instance [BHJ16]). As an example, we may deduce the following formula for the asymptotics of the Monge-Ampère energy functional by recalling that if ω is a Kähler form on X and $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a subgeodesic ray, then

$$\mathrm{E}_{(\omega,\ldots,\omega)}(\varphi_t,\ldots,\varphi_t) = \frac{1}{(n+1)V}\mathrm{E}(\varphi_t).$$

Corollary 4.9. *Assume that $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ is smooth and dominates $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. For each smooth ray $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$, we then have*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{E}(\varphi_t)}{t} = \mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$$

with

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A}) := \frac{(\mathcal{A}^{n+1})}{(n+1)V}.$$

Remark 4.10. Here E^{NA} makes reference to the *non-Archimedean Monge-Ampère energy functional*, see [BHJ15] for an explanation of the terminology.

5. Asymptotics for the K-energy

Let (X,ω) be a compact Kähler manifold and $\alpha := [\omega] \in H^{1,1}(X,\mathbb{R})$ a Kähler class on X. As before, let $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ be a smooth, relatively Kähler cohomological test configuration for (X,α) dominating $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. In this section we explain how the above Theorem B can be used to compute the asymptotic slope of the Mabuchi (K-energy) functional along rays (φ^t), $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$. This is the content of Theorem C. It is useful to keep the case of weak geodesic rays (as constructed in Lemma 4.4) in mind, which in turn implies K-semistability of (X,α) (Theorem A).

Regarding the proof of Theorem C, note that the Mabuchi functional is in fact of the form $\mathrm{E}_{(\theta_0,\dots,\theta_n)}(\varphi_0^t,\dots,\varphi_n^t)$ for the appropriate choice of closed $(1,1)$-forms θ_i on X and rays (φ_i^t) on X, but the Theorem B does not directly apply in this situation. Indeed, the expression for the Mabuchi functional involves the metric $\log(\omega+dd^c\varphi_t)^n$ on $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}$, which may blow up close to $\mathcal{X}_0$. However, a key point is that there are functionals of the above form that satisfy the same asymptotic slope as the Mabuchi functional (up to an explicit error term), and to which we may apply Theorem B. More precisely, following [BHJ16], the idea is to cook up a functional F of the above 'multivariate' form, for which

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t)}{t}=\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{F}(\varphi_t)}{t}+V^{-1}((\mathcal{X}_{0,\mathrm{red}}-\mathcal{X}_0)\cdot\mathcal{A}^n)_{\mathcal{X}},$$

and use Theorem B to choose F so that moreover $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\mathrm{F}(\varphi_t)/t=\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$. It follows that the asymptotic slope of the Mabuchi (K-energy) functional equals $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})+V^{-1}((\mathcal{X}_{0,\mathrm{red}}-\mathcal{X}_0)\cdot\mathcal{A}^n)_{\mathcal{X}}=:\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$.

5.1. **A weak version of Theorem C.** We first explain how to obtain a weak version of Theorem C, as a direct consequence of Theorem B. This version is more direct to establish than the full Theorem C, and will in fact be sufficient in order to prove K-semistability of (X,α), cf. Theorem A of the introduction, as explained in Section 5.2.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ be a smooth, relatively Kähler cohomological test configuration for (X,α) dominating $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. For each subgeodesic ray $(\varphi^t)_{t\geq 0}$, $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$, we have the inequality*[4]

$$\limsup_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t)}{t}\leq\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A}).$$

Remark 5.2. In view of the strong version (see Theorem 5.5) we actually know that the limit is well-defined and, moreover, we obtain this way the precise asymptotic slope of the Mabuchi functional, see Section 5.3.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be any smooth metric on $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}:=K_{\mathcal{X}}-\pi^*K_{\mathbb{P}^1}$. Using the $\mathbb{C}^*$-action on $\mathcal{X}$ we can associate to $\mathcal{B}$ a ray of smooth metrics on K_X that we denote by $(\beta_t)_{t\geq 0}$ (or $(\beta_\tau)_{\tau\in\bar{\Delta}^*}$ for its reparametrisation by $t=-\log|\tau|$). Fix $\log\omega^n$ as a reference metric on K_X, and let

$$\xi^t_{\mathcal{B}}:=\log\left(\frac{e^{\beta_\tau}}{\omega^n}\right),\tag{8}$$

i.e. the function given as the difference of metrics $\beta_\tau-\log\omega^n$ on X. The constructed ray $(\xi^t_{\mathcal{B}})_{t\geq 0}$ is then $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible with the cohomological test configuration $(\mathcal{X},K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1})$ for (X,K_X).

Now let $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a subgeodesic ray $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$. By Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.6 and Theorem 4.7 it follows that

$$\frac{\mathrm{E}_{(-\mathrm{Ric}(\omega),\omega\dots,\omega)}(\xi^t_{\mathcal{B}},\varphi_t\dots,\varphi_t)}{t}\longrightarrow V^{-1}(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}\cdot\mathcal{A}^n)_{\mathcal{X}}\tag{9}$$

[4]The limit is in fact well-defined, as shown in Section 5.3 below.

as $t \to +\infty$. Indeed, by Lemma 4.2 we may choose a smooth subgeodesic ray $(\varphi'_t)_{t\geq 0}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ that is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible (and hence also L^∞- and $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible) with $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$. Up to replacing (φ_t) with (φ'_t) we may thus assume that (φ_t) is smooth and $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$, using Lemma 4.6, so that Theorem 4.7 applies.

Motivated by the Chen-Tian formula (5) and the identity (9), we thus introduce the notation

$$\mathrm{F}(\varphi_t) := \bar{\mathcal{S}}\mathrm{E}(\varphi_\tau) + \mathrm{E}_{(-\mathrm{Ric}(\omega),\omega\dots,\omega)}(\xi^t_{\mathcal{B}}, \varphi_t \dots, \varphi_t),$$

the point being that the asymptotic slope of this functional coincides with the Donaldson-Futaki invariant (even when the central fiber is not reduced).

Lemma 5.3.

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{\mathrm{F}(\varphi_t)}{t} = \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$$

.

Proof. This result is an immediate consequence of (9), the Chen-Tian formula (5) and Corollary 4.9. □

Hence, it suffices to establish the following inequality

$$\limsup_{t\to+\infty} \frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t)}{t} \leq \lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{\mathrm{F}(\varphi_t)}{t}.$$

To do this, we set $\Gamma(\tau) := (\mathrm{M} - \mathrm{F})(\varphi_t)$. By the Chen-Tian formula (5) and cancellation of terms we have

$$\Gamma(\tau) = \bar{\mathcal{S}}\mathrm{E}(\varphi_t) - \mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{Ric}(\omega)}(\varphi_t) + \int_X \log\left(\frac{(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n}{\omega^n}\right)(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n$$

$$-\bar{\mathcal{S}}\mathrm{E}(\varphi_t) - \mathrm{E}_{(-\mathrm{Ric}(\omega),\omega\dots,\omega)}(\xi^t_{\mathcal{B}}, \varphi_t \dots, \varphi_t)$$

$$= -\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{Ric}(\omega)}(\varphi_t) + \int_X \log\left(\frac{(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n}{\omega^n}\right)(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n - \int_X \xi^t_{\mathcal{B}}\,(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n$$

$$+\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\int_X \varphi_t\,\mathrm{Ric}(\omega)\wedge\omega^j\wedge(\omega + dd^c\varphi_t)^{n-j-1}$$

$$= \int_X \log\left(\frac{(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n}{\omega^n}\right)(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n - \int_X \log\left(\frac{e^{\beta_\tau}}{\omega^n}\right)\,(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n$$

$$= \int_X \log\left(\frac{(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n}{e^{\beta_\tau}}\right)(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n,$$

recalling the definition (8) of $\xi^t_{\mathcal{B}}$ and Definition 2.1.

In view of Proposition 3.8, we as usual let D denote the unique $\mathbb{R}$-divisor supported on $\mathcal{X}_0$ such that $\mathcal{A} = \mu^* p_1^* \alpha + [D]$, with $p_1 : X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \to X$ the first projection. Fix a choice of an S^1-invariant function 'Green function' ψ_D for D, so that $\delta_D = \theta_D + dd^c\psi_D$ with θ_D a smooth S^1-invariant closed $(1,1)$-form on $\mathcal{X}$.

Moreover, set $\Omega := \mu^* p_1^* \alpha + \theta_D$ (for which $[\Omega] = \mathcal{A}$ then holds) and let Φ denote the S^1-invariant function on $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ corresponding to the ray (φ_t). In particular, the function $\Phi \circ \mu + \psi_D$ extends to a smooth Ω-psh function Ψ on $\mathcal{X}$, by $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-compatibility.

With the above notation in place, the integrand in the above expression for $\Gamma(\tau)$ can be written

$$\log\left(\frac{(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n}{e^{\beta_\tau}}\right) = \mu_*\left(\log\left(\frac{(\Omega + dd^c\Psi)^n \wedge \pi^*(\sqrt{-1}\, d\tau \wedge d\bar{\tau})}{\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}}\right)\right),$$

where

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{B}} := e^{\mathcal{B} + \pi^* \log(\sqrt{-1}\, d\tau \wedge d\bar{\tau})}$$

is the volume form defined by the smooth metric $\mathcal{B} + \pi^* \log(\sqrt{-1}\, d\tau \wedge d\bar{\tau})$ on $K_{\mathcal{X}}$. Since Ψ is Ω-psh on $\mathcal{X}$ and $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a volume form on $\mathcal{X}$, this quantity is bounded from above. Moreover, we integrate against the measure $(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n$ which can be computed in cohomology, thus has mass independent of τ. Hence

$$\Gamma(\tau) = \int_X \log\left(\frac{(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n}{e^{\beta_\tau}}\right)(\omega + dd^c\varphi_\tau)^n \leq O(1).$$

Dividing by t and passing to the limit now concludes the proof. □

As explained below, the above 'weak Theorem C' actually suffices to yield our main result.

5.2. **Proof of Theorem A.** Let X be a compact Kähler manifold and ω a given Kähler form, with $\alpha := [\omega] \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ the corresponding Kähler class. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a cohomological test configuration for (X, α) which by Proposition 3.10 can be assumed to be smooth, relatively Kähler and dominating $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Consider the associated weak geodesic ray $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ emanating from ω (i.e. such that $\varphi_0 = 0$), which due to [Che00b] (cf. also [Blo13], [Dar14], [DL12]) is $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$. It now follows from convexity of the Mabuchi functional along weak geodesic rays, cf. [BB15, CLP14], that the Mabuchi functional is bounded from below (in the given class α). In particular, we have $\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t) \geq -C$ for some uniform constant C. Dividing by t and passing to the limit, we thus conclude that

$$\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) \geq \limsup_{t \to +\infty} \frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t)}{t} \geq 0,$$

using the weak version of Theorem C, cf. Theorem 5.1. Since the cohomological test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ for (X, α) was chosen arbitrarily, this shows that (X, α) is K-semistable (in the generalised sense of Definition 3.6).

Remark 5.4. The latter paragraph is the only instance in which we use convexity of the Mabuchi functional along weak geodesic rays. Up until this point, for instance in establishing Theorem B and Theorem C, we only use convexity of $\mathrm{E}_{(\omega_0, \ldots, \omega_n)}(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n)$ along subgeodesics, which (by contrast) is immediate to establish.

5.3. **Asymptotic slope of the K-energy and proof of Theorem C.** Building on Section 5.1 we now improve on the weak version of Theorem C (cf. Theorem 5.1) by computing the asymptotic slope of the Mabuchi (K-energy) functional (even when the central fiber is not reduced). To this end, recall the definition of the non-Archimedean Mabuchi functional, i.e. the intersection number

$$\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A}) := \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A}) + V^{-1}((\mathcal{X}_{0,\mathrm{red}} - \mathcal{X}_0)\cdot \mathcal{A}^n)_{\mathcal{X}},$$

discussed in Section 3.6. Note that it satisfies $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A}) \leq \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ with equality precisely when the central fiber is reduced.

Adapting the techniques of [BHJ16] to the present setting we now obtain the following result, corresponding to Theorem C of the introduction.

Theorem 5.5. *Let X be a compact Kähler manifold and $\alpha \in H^{1,1}(X,\mathbb{R})$ a Kähler class. Suppose that $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ is a smooth, relatively Kähler cohomological test configuration for (X,α) dominating $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. Then, for each subgeodesic ray $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$, $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible with $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$, the asymptotic slope of the Mabuchi functional is well-defined and satisfies*

$$\frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t)}{t} \longrightarrow \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$$

as $t\to+\infty$.

Remark 5.6. In particular, this result holds when $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is the weak geodesic ray associated to $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$, constructed in Section 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.5. Following ideas of [BHJ16] we associate to the given smooth, relatively Kähler and dominating test configuration $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ for (X,α) another test configuration $(\mathcal{X}',\mathcal{A}')$ for (X,α) which is semistable, i.e. smooth and such that $\mathcal{X}'_0$ is a reduced $\mathbb{R}$-divisor with simple normal crossings. As previously noted, we can also assume that $\mathcal{X}'$ dominates the product. In the terminology of Section 3.6, this construction comes with a morphism $g_d\circ\rho : \mathcal{X}'\to\mathcal{X}$, cf. the diagram in Section 3.6. Pulling back, we set $\mathcal{A}' := g_d^*\rho^*\mathcal{A}$. Note that $\mathcal{A}'$ is no longer relatively Kähler, but merely relatively semipositive (with the loss of positivity occuring along $\mathcal{X}'_0$).

On the one hand, Lemma 3.14 yields

$$\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}',\mathcal{A}') = d\cdot \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A}), \tag{10}$$

where $d>0$ is the degree of the morphism g_d. On the other hand, we may consider the pull back by $g_d\circ\rho$ of the weak geodesic $(\varphi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ associated to $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$. This induces a subgeodesic $(\varphi'_t)_{t\geq 0}$ which is $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}_{\mathbb{C}}$-compatible with the test configuration $(\mathcal{X}',\mathcal{A}')$ for (X,α) (in particular, the boundedness of the Laplacian is preserved under pullback by $g_d\circ\rho$). Replacing τ by τ^d amounts to replacing t by $d\cdot t$, so that

$$\frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi'_t)}{t} = d\cdot\frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t)}{t}. \tag{11}$$

Combining equations (10) and (11) it thus follows that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi_t)}{t} = \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$$

if and only if

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi'_t)}{t} = \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}',\mathcal{A}'). \tag{12}$$

In other words, it suffices to establish (12) above. By the asymptotic formula 5.3 it is in turn equivalent to show that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{M}(\varphi'_t)}{t}=\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{F}(\varphi'_t)}{t}.$$

We use the notation of the proof of Theorem 5.1. In particular, we set $\Gamma(\tau):=(M-\mathrm{F})(\varphi'_\tau)$. As in the proof of Theorem 5.1 we have an upper bound $\Gamma(\tau)\leq O(1)$, using that the restriction of the relatively semipositive class $\mathcal{A}'$ to $\mathcal{X}'\setminus\mathcal{X}'_0$ is in fact relatively Kähler.

To obtain a lower estimate of $\Gamma(\tau)$ we consider the Monge-Ampere measure $\mathrm{MA}(\varphi'_\tau):=V^{-1}(\omega+dd^c\varphi'_\tau)^n$ and note that

$$V^{-1}\Gamma(\tau)=V^{-1}\int_X\log\left(\frac{(\omega+dd^c\varphi'_\tau)^n}{e^{\beta_\tau}}\right)=$$

$$=\int_X\log\left(\frac{\mathrm{MA}(\varphi'_\tau)}{e^{\beta_\tau}/\int_X e^{\beta_\tau}}\right)\mathrm{MA}(\varphi'_\tau)-\log\int_X e^{\beta_\tau}\geq-\log\int_X e^{\beta_\tau},$$

since the relative entropy of the two probability measures $\mathrm{MA}(\varphi_\tau)$ and $e^{\beta_\tau}/\int_X e^{\beta_\tau}$ is non-negative. We now conclude by estimating this integral, using the following result from [BHJ16]:

Lemma 5.7. ([BHJ16]). *Let $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A})$ be a semistable and dominating test configuration for (X,α) and let $\mathcal{B}$ be any smooth metric on $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}$. Let $(\beta^t)_{t\geq0}$ be the family of smooth metrics on K_X induced by $\mathcal{B}$. Denote by $p\geq1$ the largest integer such that $p-1$ distinct irreducible components of $\mathcal{X}_0$ have a non-empty intersection. Then there are positive constants A and B such that*

$$At^{2(p-1)}\leq\int_X e^{\beta^t}\leq Bt^{2(p-1)}.$$

holds for all t.

We refer the reader to [BHJ16] for the proof and here simply apply the result: Recalling that $t=-\log|\tau|$, Lemma 5.7 yields that $\log\int_X e^{\beta_\tau}=o(t)$ and so it follows from

$$\frac{-\log\int_X e^{\beta_\tau}}{t}\leq\frac{\Gamma(\tau)}{t}\leq\frac{O(1)}{t}$$

that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\Gamma(\tau)}{t}=0,$$

completing the proof. □

References

[BB15] R. Berman and B. Berndtsson, *Convexity of the K-energy on the space of Kähler metrics and uniqueness of extremal metrics*, Preprint Arxiv: 1405.0401 (2015).

[BBGZ13] R. Berman, S. Boucksom, V. Guedj, and A. Zeriahi, *A variational approach to complex Monge-Ampère equations*, Publ. Math. de l'IHES **117** (2013), 179–245.

[Ber13] R. Berman, *From Monge-Ampère equations to envelopes and geodesic rays in the zero temperature limit*, Preprint arXiv: 1307.3008 (2013).

[Ber15] ———, *K-polystability of Q-Fano varieties admitting Kähler-Einstein metrics*, Invent. Math. (2015), 1–53.

[BG13] S. Boucksom and V. Guedj, *Regularizing properties of the Kähler-Ricci flow*, An introduction to the Kähler-Ricci flow (S. Boucksom, P. Eyssidieux, and V. Guedj, eds.), Lecture notes in mathematics 2086, Springer-Verlag, 2013, pp. 189 – 238.

[BHJ15] S. Boucksom, T. Hisamoto, and M. Jonsson, *Uniform K-stability, Duistermaat-Heckman measures and singularities of pairs*, Preprint arXiv:1504.06568v1 (2015).

[BHJ16] ———, *Uniform K-stability and coercivity of the K-energy*, Preprint (2016).

[BHPdV04] W. P. Barth, K. Hulek, C.A.M. Peters, and A. Van de Ven, *Compact complex surfaces*, 2 ed., vol. 4, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. A series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2004.

[Blo13] Z. Blocki, *The Calabi-Yau theorem. Complex Monge-Ampère equations and geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics*, vol. 2038, Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.

[Bou12] S. Boucksom, *Monge-Ampère equations on complex manifolds with boundary*, Complex Monge-Ampère equations and geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics (V. Guedj, ed.), Lecture notes in mathematics 2038, Springer-Verlag, 2012, pp. 257 – 282.

[BT76] E.D Bedford and T.A. Taylor, *The Dirichlet problem for the complex Monge-Ampère operator*, Invent. Math. **37** (1976), 1–44.

[CDS15a] X.X. Chen, S. Donaldson, and S. Sun, *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds I: approximation of metrics with cone singularities*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), 183–197.

[CDS15b] ———, *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds II: limits with cone angle less than 2pi*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), 199–234.

[CDS15c] ———, *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds III: limits as cone angle approaches 2pi and completion of the main proof*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), 235–278.

[Che00a] X.X. Chen, *On the lower bound of the Mabuchi energy and its application*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2000), no. 12, 607–623.

[Che00b] ———, *The space of Kähler metrics*, J. Diff. Geom. **56** (2000), no. 12, 189–234.

[CLP14] X.X. Chen, L. Li, and M. Paun, *Approximation of weak geodesics and subharmonicity of Mabuchi energy*, Preprint arXiv:1409.7896v1 (2014).

[Dar14] T. Darvas, *Envelopes and geodesics in spaces of Kähler potentials*, Preprint arXiv:1401:7318 (2014).

[Dem12] J-P. Demailly, *Complex analytic and differential geometry*, Open source (2012).

[DL12] T. Darvas and L. Lempert, *Weak geodesic rays in the space of Kähler metrics*, Math. Research Letters **19** (2012), no. 5.

[Don02] S.K. Donaldson, *Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties*, J. Diff. Geom. (2002), no. 62, 289–349.

[Don05a] ———, *Lower bounds on the Calabi functional*, J. Diff. Geom. **70** (2005), no. 3, 453–472.

[Don05b] ———, *Scalar curvature and projective embeddings, II*, Q J Math **56** (2005), no. 3, 345–356.

[Elk90] R. Elkik, *Métriques sur les fibrés d'intersection*, Duke math. journal (1990), no. 1, 303–328.

[Fis76] G. Fischer, *Complex Analytic Geometry*, vol. 538, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer Verlag, 1976.

[KKMSD73] G. Kempf, F. Knudsen, D. Mumford, and B. Saint-Donat, *Toroidal embeddings 1*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg (1973).

[KNX15] J. Kollár, J. Nicaise, and C. Xu, *Semi-stable extensions over 1-dimensional bases*, arXiv:1510.02446v1 (2015).

[Kol07] J. Kollár, *Resolution of singularities – Seattle lecture*, arXiv:math/0508332v3 (2007).

[Li11] C. Li, *Constant scalar curvature Kähler metric obtains the minimum of the K-energy*, Int. Math. Res. Notices (2011), no. 9, 2161–2175.

[Mab08] T. Mabuchi, *K-stability of constant scalar curvature polarization*, Preprint arXiv:0812.4093 (2008).

[Oda13] Y. Odaka, *A generalization of the Ross Thomas slope theory*, Osaka J. of Math. **50** (2013), no. 1, 171–185.

[PRS08] D. H. Phong, J. Ross, and J. Sturm, *Deligne pairings and the Knudsen-Mumford expansion*, J. Diff. Geom. **78** (2008), no. 3, 475–496.

[PT06] S. Paul and G. Tian, *CM stability and the generalized Futaki invariant*, arXiv: math.AG/0605278 (2006).

[PT09] ———, *CM stability and the generalized Futaki invariant II*, Astérisque (2009), no. 328, 339–354.

[RT06] J. Ross and R.P. Thomas, *An obstruction to the existence of constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics*, J. Diff. Geom. **72** (2006), no. 429-466.

[Sem92] S. Semmes, *Complex Monge-Ampère equations and symplectic manifolds*, Amer. J. Math **114** (1992), 495–550.

[Sto09a] J. Stoppa, *K-stability of constant scalar curvature Kähler manifolds*, Advances in Mathematics **221** (2009), 1397–1408.

[Sto09b] ———, *Twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics and Kähler slope stability*, J. Diff. Geom. **83** (2009), 663–691.

[Sze14] G. Szekelyhidi, *Introduction to extremal Kähler metrics*, vol. 152, Graduate studies in mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence RI, 2014.

[Tia97] G. Tian, *Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature*, Invent. Math. **130** (1997), no. 1, 1–37.

[Tia15] ———, *K-stability and Kähler-Einstein metrics.*, Communications on Pure and Applied Math. **68** (2015), 1085–1156.

[Wan12] X. Wang, *Height and GIT weight*, Math. Res. Lett. **19** (2012), no. 04, 909–926.

[Yau06] S-T. Yau, *Perspectives on geometric analysis*, Surv. Differ. Geom. **X** (2006).

Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse
E-mail address: zakarias.sjostrom@math.univ-toulouse.fr